



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,470	03/11/2004	Daniel H. Teitelbaum	UM-08764	7421

72960 7590
Casimir Jones, S.C.
440 Science Drive
Suite 203
Madison, WI 53711

01/04/2008

EXAMINER

SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/798,470	Applicant(s) TEITELBAUM ET AL.	
	Examiner Phyllis G. Spivack	Art Unit 1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10-31-07; 12-6-07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Prior indications of finality and allowability are withdrawn.

Applicants' Amendment filed October 31, 2007 is acknowledged. Claims 22 and 23 are canceled. A Supplementary Response filed December 6, 2007 is further acknowledged in which Applicants provide a summary of the telephonic interview which took place October 29, 2007. Rejections not herein reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following objections and rejection are newly applied and constitute the complete set presently applied to the instant claims. Claims 1-4, 7 and 18-21 remain under consideration.

The disclosure is objected to for the following informalities: the structures depicted in claim 7 are unclear. In the event of allowance of the instant claims, the printer would return the case to the Examiner because the elements of the compounds are not clearly depicted.

Appropriate correction is required.

The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to an unpublished U.S. application, foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Applicants are required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference, if the material is relied upon to overcome any objection, rejection, or other requirement imposed by the Office. The amendment must be accompanied by a statement executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the material being inserted is the material previously incorporated by reference and that the amendment contains no new matter. See 37 CFR 1.57(f).

The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to examples of ACE inhibitors that find use in the presently claimed methods is ineffective because ACE inhibitors are essential subject matter. There are no disclosed Examples wherein a specific inhibitor is administered. The Examples are prophetic.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4, 7 and 18-21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 11/542576. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the co-pending application are drawn to methods of treating inflammatory bowel disease comprising administering any angiotensin converting enzyme.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Beclometasone dipropionate is a glucocorticoid steroid, not an angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor.

Clarification is required.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moore, L., EP 0 418 582.

Moore teaches the administration of angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, such as captopril, fosinopril, ceranapril, enalapril or lisopril, to treat inflammatory bowel diseases. See the Abstract. Various dosage forms are disclosed on page 3 for oral or rectal administration. See claims 1 and 13-15 on page 9. Administration to mammalian species, including humans, is disclosed on page 2, lines 48-49.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moskowitz, D.W., in view of The Merck Manual.

Moskowitz teaches the administration of angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors to treat inflammatory bowel diseases. See claim 12, page 41. In particular, the inflammatory bowel disease, diverticulitis is specifically disclosed on page 6 as among those inflammatory bowel diseases contemplated. As required by instant claim 7, those ACE species contemplated are disclosed on page 28, lines 14-18. Moskowitz fails to teach a reduction in the characteristics that define an inflammatory bowel disease, such as histological parameters, the presence of heme positive stools, weight loss and clinical severity of colitis. However, the qualitative and quantitative determinations of such characteristics are conventionally examined when a practitioner in the art of gastroenterology ascertains the progression of an inflammatory bowel disease. The **Inflammatory Bowel Diseases** section of The Merck Manual establishes that weight loss, histological parameters, heme positive stools and clinical symptoms are routinely followed in patients having inflammatory bowel diseases. See, in particular, the sections describing Pathology and Symptoms, Signs and Complications. A reference may be applied for all it teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the gastroenterology art. In view of the combined teachings of Moore and The Merck Manual, it would have been reasonable to expect a reduction in the severity of an inflammatory bowel disease following the administration of an ACE inhibitor.

Application/Control Number:
10/798,470
Art Unit: 1614

Page 6

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack whose telephone number is 571-272-0585. The Examiner can normally be reached on 10:30 AM-7 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 591-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phyllis Spivack
Phyllis G. Spivack
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614

**PHYLLIS SPIVACK
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

December 28, 2007